

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-18 were pending prior to the final Office Action. Claims 3, 8, 9, 12, 17, and 18 have been cancelled through this Reply. Thus, claims 1-2, 4-7, 10-11, are 13-16 currently pending of which claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 15, and 16 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 15, and 16 have been amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

#### **Interview Summary**

Applicants thank the Examiner for initiating telephone interviews with the Applicants' representative on June 3, 2009 and June 12, 2009. During the interviews, the Examiner proposed an "Examiner's Amendment" to place the application in condition for allowance. More specifically, the Examiner suggested that amending the independent claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 15, and 16 to recite the subject-matter of claims 3 or 12 would render the claims allowable. The Examiner also suggested possible amendment to overcome the alleged objection and statutory rejection. Although the Applicants' representative do not necessarily agree with the Examiner that further amendment may be necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the pending claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner in order to expedite prosecution.

#### **Objection to the Specification**

The specification stands objected to for minor informalities. This objection is moot in view of the amendment.

#### **Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants amended claims 1, 6, and 7 and canceled claims 3, 8, and 9 as suggested by the Examiner during the interviews of June 3, 2009 and June 12, 2009. Thus, this rejection is moot in view of the amendment.

**Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Shinohara (U.S. Patent No. 7,310,514). Applicants cancelled claims 3, 8, 9, 12, 17, and 18 and amended claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 15, and 16 as suggested by the Examiner during the interviews of June 3, 2009 and June 12, 2009. Thus, this rejection is moot in view of the amendment.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 25, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  # 58,755  
D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40,439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicants